

REMARKS

Claims 6-11 and 13-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 6-8 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives by Examiners Williams and Zimmerman in the February 11, 2004 personal interview. The remarks below constitute the Applicant's record of the interview. During the personal interview claims 6 and 7 were discussed. It was agreed that claims 6 and 7 are distinguishable over U.S. Patent No. 6,531,815 to Okuyama. However, an agreement was not reached that claims 6 and 7 are distinguishable over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,324 to Hirano.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,324 to Hirano. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office Action asserts that Hirano discloses at least a first electrode layer (MgAa cathode Fig. 4, Reference 55), a light emitting layer (light emitting layer Reference 53) and a second electrode layer formed (ITO anode Reference 51, layered portion) in that order, above a substrate (insulated substrate Reference 31).

It is respectfully submitted that Hirano does not disclose or teach all of the features recited in amended claim 6. Specifically, Hirano does not disclose or teach the feature wherein the intervening layer is the light emitting layer.

Hirano discloses a second terminal (41, Fig. 4) electrically connected to the second electrode layer (51) which penetrates the insulator film (56) and does not penetrate the light emitting layer as recited in claim 6.

Support for the amendment to claim 6 is found at least on page 6, paragraphs 22 and 23 and Fig. 1(f).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,764 to Xu et al. ("Xu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Hirano is deficient for the reasons stated above regarding claim 6. Specifically, Hirano does not disclose or suggest that the intervening layer is the light emitting layer.

Xu does not make up for this deficiency. Xu merely discloses an electronic apparatus used within an organic EL device.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 6-11 and 13-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

JAO:DEB/tbh

Date: February 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--